

Date: Sun, 16 Oct 94 04:30:08 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #492
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 16 Oct 94 Volume 94 : Issue 492

Today's Topics:

ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE
 Get Over It
 I know - a typing test! ;)
 Packet Pass-Fail?
 The code debate....my view
 Transmitter Sale to N

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 09:46:36 -0400 (EDT)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access1.digex.net>
Subject: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

On Wed, 12 Oct 1994, Dan Pickersgill wrote:

> >Considering how much I had to go through to get this out quickly since the
> >ballots have already been mailed, I'm flattered that you guys only found
> >fault with one question. However, the phrasing is deliberate and is based
> >on the usual argument that is proffered for eliminating the code from
> >amateur radio examinations.
>
> That the phrasing is deliberate is obvious. That is one way that can
> skew the outcome of a survey, by stating things in a manner to get an
> expected response or cause confusion in the mind of the person answering
> the survey.

I've already responded to your comment. This isn't a survey. There are only five people responding. Go back and read my original posting and perhaps you'll understand the purpose of the questionnaire.

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 08:51:00 EST
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
Subject: Get Over It

gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>To address your last paragraph, Bill, regarding the need to pass
>13wpm... Some people refer to this as "high-speed" testing. I don't
>think that anyone who has learned to use Morse as a true means of
>communication would say that 13 wpm is "high-speed". Actually, it is
>about the bottom of the scale of actual proficiency. The "value" of
>Morse at lower speeds is really quite questionable. Thus, if CW has
>any value or relevance to gaining access to HF at all, 13 wpm
>expectation seems quite reasonable.

>

>Is it relevant to require CW at all? Obviously, nothing anyone in
>either camp can say will do much to convince anyone in the other
>camp...you don't have to follow these discussions long to figure that
>out. I believe it is relevant simply because it is one of the two
>modes most used on HF by the international ham community, and
>international communication is, to a great degree, what HF operating
>is all about. It has many favorable advantages, and while there are
>new digital modes which are currently more "efficient", or better
>under weak-signal conditions, or faster (as measured in "throughput"),
>it remains true that virtually every HF amateur station in the world
>has CW capability available _right now_. In addition, Morse, while
>not a language, _does_ facilitate communication among people who do
>not share verbal fluency in any common language. As someone will
>point out, the same techniques could be (and are) extended to the
>other digital modes, but these modes are still not used by even a
>large minority of hams world-wide.

>

>Bottom line...CW is simple, effective, affordable, available, and used
>by a majority of the international ham community. HF is an
>international venue. For many of us OFs, that's enough reason to
>support the continued requirement. I guess you could consider it
>"goodwill dues".

Two full paragraphs, semantic content;

"I had to so you have too!"

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 14:22:52 GMT
From: jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)
Subject: I know - a typing test! ;)

Andrew C Robertson (drewbob@mit.edu) wrote:
: Let's establish HF digital subbands and grant access to anyone who passes
: a 60 word per minute typing test (5 errors max).

: Someone's still going to whine. hee hee

: 73 de aa1hx

Hmmmmmm. Yeah! That's it! Now why didn't I think of that?
Very good Andy. Why don't we start pushing this the same as the
"get-rid-of code" proponents are doing with their ideas? I like
this one! ;)

73 de WK1V

-jim-

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 15:06:25 GMT
From: zcap134@ucl.ac.uk (Redvers Llewellyn Davies)
Subject: Packet Pass-Fail?

gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>Just a little musing: If CW (manual Morse) did not exist...had never
>existed...and the two most common modes in international use on HF
>were SSB and PACKET, do you think there would be an emphasis on packet
>on the exams...maybe even a separate pass/fail test?

If CW did not exist then voice comms would not exist. Packet would not exist and radio would not exist in its present form. The technology to encode and decode information on a carrier would not exist if the carrier itself had not been invented.

Not voice radio. No packet. No internet. No exam. No problem.

Red, GW0TJO

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 16:17:04 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Subject: The code debate....my view

jangus@skylld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus) writes:

>In article <37fe31\$7j0@newsbf01.news.aol.com> tomsunman@aol.com writes:

> > I think the "no codes" are taking a bit of a beating here from what
> > I've been reading. Just because someone is not i

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 14:16:13 GMT
From: jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)
Subject: Transmitter Sale to N

Niles Stacey (niles.stacey@infoway.com) wrote:

: I'm kinda' glad that this topic is getting so much attention. It will
: tend to make us think about what we are doing with what equipment.
: Hopefully we will all learn a little here!

I just thought I'd jump in and let everyone know that I sold a
couple of HF rigs <new> FT-840 & FT-890 to a couple of people
who had no amateur license. Bleh hehehe hehehe heh hehehehehehe.
Whatcha gonna do?

-jim-

Date: 15 Oct 1994 09:06:26 -0400
From: wb2mpk@gti.gti.net (Glen Johnson)

References<37md5e\$1pc@chnews.intel.com> <37n7sg\$3n9@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<37nsh7\$ncm@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com wrote:

: interfere with the rights of others. I fail to see how granting HF phone
: privileges to properly qualified amateurs would interfere with the rights

: of any other amateurs. High speed Morse code is not a valid qualifier for
: good HF phone operation.

I agree with this assessment. I got my Novice in 1978. Played CW on 40m for about a year, got bored, and went inactive. 13 years later, I upgraded to Technician and got back in. Passed General on 7/19/94, Advanced on 7/22/94, and Extra on 9/29/94 . I was on a wild upgrade spree for a while.

Had Novice enhancement been around in 1978, I might not have gone inactive. But I have absolutely no interest in CW whatsoever. If I had the ability to gab on 10m phone when I got my license, I might have stuck with it.

I view code testing as an irrelevant obstacle to upgrading. I wanted an Extra class license, so I knew what I had to do to get it, and I did it, but I do consider it a waste of my time. Today, if you're a codeless Tech, you can pass a 5wpm code test and get phone privs on 10m. Sure you get CW privs on 10, 15, 40 and 80 too, but few people who upgrade to Tech Plus from Tech do so to get those CW privileges.

Ideally, I would like Morse testing to go away completely, and have the written exams become much more difficult. It is true that you can spend a great deal of time memorizing answers and pass any of the current tests. Make the questions harder, double the number of questions in the pool, and go back to the fill-in-the-blanks format.

However, I've no interest in chasing CW off the bands, either, any more than I'm interested in chasing packet off the bands . I don't operate either mode, but lotsa people do, so more power to them.

Alternatively, I would support Morse testing if what you got for passing a code test was CW privileges in the bands. Maybe you shouldn't be allowed to operate CW without passing a code test. Maybe you should be able to operate phone on all the HF bands for passing 2, 3A and 3B, then get the CW segments too if you pass 1B. Hehehe. The No Code General :) The primary advantage to passing a 13wpm code test is PHONE privs in the HF bands. And that just doesn't make sense to me. Major in Law and get a medical degree :)

My guess is that I will live to see the end of code testing in my lifetime (I'm 33) . So, I'm not gonna lose any sleep over it now :)

Glen Johnson - wb2mpk@gti.net
Manager: GENie Sports RoundTable
Radio & Electronics RT

GENie address: SPORTS

Fantasy Sports Leagues RT

RADIO.RT

Date: 15 Oct 1994 00:31:12 GMT
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<37h27k\$8oc@chnews.intel.com> <37l42q\$hu7@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<37md5e\$1pc@chnews.intel.com>
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com wrote:
: In article <37l42q\$hu7@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
: gregory brown <gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu> wrote:

: >...I was laughing at your analogy.

: You didn't seem to understand the analogy. The analogy was...

: being coerced to endure something of no value on the way to acquiring
: something of value. CW is of no value to approximately half the hams
: on HF who never use it after they pass their general/advanced tests.
: It just sits there, like an unused TSR, accomplishing no useful purpose.
: --
: 73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (All my own personal fuzzy logic, not Intel's)

You haven't addressed my often stated feeling that the fact that a large proportion of the international community of hams use and have access to CW/Morse, and that since HF is an international communications venue, and that CW does help hams communicate who do not share verbal fluency in a common language, and that part of our role as hams is to foster international goodwill...etc. etc., is enough justification to require it. Again, it is simple, affordable, accessible, and currently present in virtually every international HF shack. Don't you think this is important?

If indeed "approximately half the hams on HF never use it after they pass their tests", it does not mean that CW is of no value, but rather that those operators have chosen to ignore a mode that is very important to world amateurs. That is their choice, of course, but it certainly does not reflect negatively on the true value of the mode.

Greg WB0RTK

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 09:00:00 EST
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<37g3no\$714@crcnis1.unl.edu> <37h27k\$8oc@chnews.intel.com>,
<CxoFI2.E3z@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:

>

>>gregory brown <gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu> wrote:

>

>>>Now, if 38% + of all the electrical engineering literature was
>>>published in another language, you can bet your rubber sea-serpent
>>>that they would require foreign language for a BSEE.

>

>>Are you saying

>>that German, Japanese, French, etc. engineers have nothing

>>to offer to the world of God-like, English-speaking peoples? Give me a break.

>

>How did you interpret that, Cec? That's *not* what Greg said.

>

>>At least 38% of all the electrical engineering literature is published
>>in another language (and often translated into English).

>

>Thus, those universities that no longer require two years of a foreign
>language for the 4 year degree are not only doing their students a
>disservice but also hurting them professionally.

>

>So you are agreeing that 38% (more like 50%) is not an insignificant
>figure?

>

>Nothing that Greg said would warrant your saying:

>

>>Does being narrow-

>>minded about CW go along with also being narrow-minded about the English
>>language? Some of the best engineers in the world do not speak English.

>>Some of the best kept engineering secrets in the world have never been
>>written down in English.

>

>If 38% of all hams (better: about 50% of HF comms) use CW then that

No Jeff, that 50% figure is STILL your analogy. And even so, for a group
self selected for morse proficiency!

>seems like a good reason to require a knowledge of CW; if 38% of
>scientific findings are written in German, then that seems like a
>good reason to require knowledge of that language for a BS degree.

No again Jeff. It is not that 38% use ONLY CW, it is that 38% REGULARLY use CW in ADDITION to any other mode. SO your analogy should be if 38% is in German AND what ever other language, should German be required on a pass/fail basis.

>Was that so difficult to understand?

Obviously, you misunderstood it.

>BTW, *this* university still requires 2 years of a foreign language.

Glad I don't go there. I wonder what Case requires?

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 14:42:43 GMT

From: gsmlrn@gsm001.mendelson.com (Geoffrey S. Mendelson)

References<37h27k\$8oc@chnews.intel.com> <CxoFI2.E3z@news.hawaii.edu>,
<37nbs\$5of@chnews.intel.com>

Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com wrote:

: >If 38% of all hams (better: about 50% of HF comms) use CW then that
: >seems like a good reason to require a knowledge of CW;

: Then are you saying that the 50% of HF hams who use CW are more important
: than the 50% who don't use CW? Why should half the HF ham population be
: hazed so the other half can feel good?

: --

The survey, sponsored by the ARRL, found that 38% of hams licensed for hf, and therefore passed a code test, used it at ANY time. Therefore 62% or almost 2/3s of all hams licensed for hf, said they NEVER use it.

73,

Geoff.

--

"I am number six. Others come and others go, but I am always number six."

(From the movie "Eminent Domain".)

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N3OWJ (215) 242-8712 gsm@mendelson.com

Date: 15 Oct 1994 00:25:28 GMT

From: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)

References<37fe31\$7j0@newsbf01.news.aol.com> <37flqb\$esl@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<101394000133Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Subject: Re: The code debate....my view

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:

: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini) writes:

: >Over the years, the written elements have

: >become easier and easier, and have now reached the point where anyone

: >can go down to their nearest Radio Shack, buy the exact question pool,

: >memorize it, and pass the test.

I passed the Novice around 1957 and the General Theory about 18 months later. I was 15 and 16 years of age respectfully. I went to the local ham/electronics shop and bought the AMECO study guides. I memorized the schematic diagrams (14 different ones as I recall) for general, I memorized the regulations parts, I was good at math, but I memorized the formulas to be able to do the few calculattioons that may have been on the test(s).

Frankly, this whole idea that folks memorize 300+ different test questions without picking up any knowledge is pure bunk. Sure some questions require a straightforward memorization of the facts and thus the answer. How (except through memorization) would anyone expect to know frequency ranges for various band segments or operating privaledges?

: In other words, nothing has to be

: >learned, no skill must be acquired, and there appears to be a lack of

: >pride or value in the ticket many of these "new hams" have supposedly

: >earned. Try listening on Two Meters sometime, which is the band that

: >they have all seemed to flock to.

I live in New Jersey, the most densely populated state in the USA with a considerable number of hams and lots are on 2 meters, BUT I just don't here whatever the alleged problem is with newly licensed hams. Maybe, the problem is regional??

: I do, a lot as I am a control operator on 2 of our very high profile

: machines on 2-Meters. Other than a few obvious assholes, some with Extra

: Class calls, 2-Meters is a nice place to have a conversation with a great
: deal of interesting people. Perhaps hams "flock" to 2-Meters because that
: is the band (in VHF+) where most people go to chat. Where most public
: service is done. Where Skywarn is. Where most repeaters that do not have
: user restrictions. And the list goes on and on.

Absolutely true for NJ. 2 meters is also, because of the repeaters,
the high runner for interest because of the many mobile units
available for the band.

--

Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)
Budd Lake, New Jersey

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 07:20:18 GMT
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)

References<37c5ak\$4mp@chnews.intel.com> <37dapa\$ksr@sugar.neosoft.com>,
<37jkt7\$sng@Times.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

kaufman@Xenon.Stanford.EDU (Marc T. Kaufman) writes:

>I suppose you think that everyone should be able to run a triathlon, too.

Bad analogy. Given enough training and motivation anyone who has full use
of their arms and legs can run/bike/swim a triathlon (not necessarily
win); it's just that most folks choose not to.

Of course, if someone is handicapped then they should find another
sport in which they're capable of participating in.

>After all, its just a matter of "motivation". Your experience notwithstanding,
>it is not equally easy for everyone to learn code.

Yes, and my eyesight prevented me from becoming a commercial airline
pilot. So I became a college math teacher instead.

If you find that the hurdle is too great then you try another
profession/hobby to work/participate in.

Becoming a ham is not a constitutional right. Yet not being able to
grasp the code is no longer a barrier with the no-code license
that's now available; you folks have a way into the hobby that those
of the previous decades never dreamed of. Count your blessings.

>(Make that Dr. Marc Kaufman, Ph.D for Dr. Michael)

Titles are meaningless on here - everyone has one! For example:

Jeff NH6IL

Jeffrey Herman, B.S. Math, 3.8 GPA (honors)
M.A. Math
Ph.D. in progress in Math
Univ. of Hawaii Lecturer in Mathematics
ex Orange County (CA) Fireman
ex US Coast Guard Radioman
Holder of 3 Hawaii State records in swimming

Date: Sat, 15 Oct 1994 09:06:00 EST
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<37l42q\$hu7@crcnis1.unl.edu> <37md5e\$1pc@chnews.intel.com>,
<37n7sg\$3n9@crcnis1.unl.edu>
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>If indeed "approximately half the hams on HF never use it after
>they pass their tests", it does not mean that CW is of no value, but
>rather that those operators have chosen to ignore a mode that is very
>important to world amateurs. That is their choice, of course, but it
>certainly does not reflect negatively on the true value of the mode.

It is 62% that reject it after being REQUIRED to learn it. I would say
that says VOLUMES about it.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword,
because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force
superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #492
